

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2-3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2-3. In Figure 2, one of elements 31 was renumbered as 31. In Figure 3, element 5 has been deleted and elements 34 are indicated.

Remarks / Arguments:**A. Objections to Drawings*****"stiffening ribs"***

The Applicant has relabeled Figure 3 to show the location of the stiffening ribs 34.

cover and rim in "substantially the same plane"

The Applicant submits that Figures 7 and 8 show the cover and rim in substantially the same plane as further described in Paragraphs [0048] and [0049] in the description.

reference character 5

Figure 3 has been amended to remove the reference to element number 5.

reference character 31

Figure 2 has been amended to replace the reference character 31 that pointed to the longitudinal axis of the flexible arm with reference character 33. The specification has been amended at Paragraph [0047] to reflect this correction.

cross-hatching of Figure 5

The Applicant cannot identify the portion of Figure 5 which is cross-hatched and cannot address this objection.

lead line of reference character 12

The Applicant cannot identify the erroneous lead line cited by the Examiner. The Applicant can only locate a single reference character 12 in Figure 1 and submits that the lead line for this character is correctly placed.

B. Objection to the Specification

The Applicant has amended Paragraphs [0012] and [0037] in response to the Examiner's concerns.

C. Objection to the Claims

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5 in response to the Examiner's concerns.

D. Rejection of the Claims***Claim 13 and improper antecedent***

The Applicant has amended claim 13 to indicate that the cover, rim and flexible arm together have an extrusion grain as the entire cup lid may be manufactured by extrusion.

Obviousness and Anticipation Rejections

The Applicant submits that the claim 1 as currently drafted is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the references cited by the examiner. The references cited by the examiner have condiment openings which are substantially centrally positioned within the cover portion. A central opening cannot be said to be "substantially opposed" to a drinking access port located near the periphery of the cover portion. The term "substantially opposed" means that the condiment opening is proximate the portion of the periphery opposite to the location of the drinking access port. The Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Figures 7 and 8 of the present application for clarification of this point.

While this may be viewed as a minor point, this positioning of the condiment opening actually reflects a distinct advantage over the centrally positioned condiment opening of the prior art references cited by the Examiner. With sealed openings in the cover of a cup lid, there is always a risk of improper sealing and leakage. When a user tips their beverage cup to drink the beverage inside, there is a greater risk with the centrally located condiment opening that fluid level will reach the periphery of the condiment opening, possibly resulting in leakage. If the flexible arm is inadvertently ripped from the rim, there is a much greater risk of leakage of the beverage with the centrally located condiment opening. The drawings on the next page are provided as demonstration of the above principle.

In conclusion, the Applicant submits that the claims as currently presented are patentable over the prior art.